

abortions by talking about removing the Hyde amendment allowing for taxpayer funding and, even worse, repealing the new Mexico City policy in which the United States gives money to organizations abroad who will wind up performing abortions. That is what the United States will become known for around the world.

How is this to respond to the natural wealth and beauty we have been given.

RECOGNIZING INDIANA COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA'S MEALS ON WHEELS 50-YEAR MILESTONE

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Meals on Wheels Program in Indiana County, Pennsylvania, who recently celebrated a 50-year milestone of helping neighbors in need.

Marty Yachisko is the lifeblood of this operation. Marty has been running the Meals on Wheels Program in Indiana County out of the local American Legion kitchen since 1981. Five days a week, Marty and his volunteers gather at the Legion to prepare meals for local senior citizens. Currently, Meals on Wheels of Indiana County is serving 35 seniors but, in the past, volunteers have served up to 70 individuals daily.

Before COVID-19, almost 10 million seniors were facing hunger threats. Meals on Wheels provides an incredibly valuable service. It is not just hot meals. For many seniors, their only social interaction of the day may be their visit from a Meals on Wheels volunteer. That connection is invaluable.

Meals on Wheels Indiana is always looking for more volunteers looking to help seniors in their community.

Thank you to Marty and the team at Meals on Wheels Indiana County for their dedication.

CELEBRATING LUNAR NEW YEAR

(Mrs. KIM of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KIM of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join my community in recognizing and celebrating the Lunar New Year.

2021 is the Year of the Ox, which represents strength, determination, and perseverance.

We have seen this spirit in the American people during the COVID-19 pandemic. And while we have faced unprecedented challenges, we have also shown that the American people are resilient. And I hope this year, this new year is filled with many blessings, joy, and renewal. I pray that this year brings success and happiness to all.

I hope to be a voice for our community to ensure that the American Dream that I was able to achieve is available for everyone and for our next

generation. Together, I know we can make a better world.

I would like to extend a happy new year to everyone.

(English translation of the statement made in Korean, Mandarin, Cantonese, and Vietnamese is as follows:)

"Happy new year."

Korean: "saehae bok mani badeuseyo"

Mandarin: "Xīnnián kuàilè"

Cantonese: "Gong hei fat choy"

Vietnamese: "Chúc Mừng Năm Mới"

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DEMINGS). The gentlewoman from California will provide the Clerk a translation of her remarks.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 72, REMOVING A CERTAIN MEMBER FROM CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 91 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 91

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 72) removing a certain Member from certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ethics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 91, to provide for the consideration of H. Res. 72, removing a certain Member from certain standing committees of the House of Representatives under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking member of the Committee on Ethics.

Madam Speaker, this is one of those moments where this institution must decide where the line is drawn.

A person in this House encouraged violence against Members of this institution, part of a larger pattern of disturbing rhetoric.

She has also called the Sandy Hook and Parkland shootings, where young children were killed, a hoax.

She followed and harassed a survivor of the Parkland shooting, David Hogg.

She promoted a video featuring a Holocaust denier which contained disgusting anti-Semitic language.

She has even claimed that 9/11 was a hoax; that a plane didn't really hit the Pentagon.

And what did our distinguished minority leader, KEVIN MCCARTHY do, Madam Speaker?

Did he take action to push this disgusting rhetoric out of the Republican conference?

No, he rewarded Congresswoman GREENE with seats on the Education and Labor and Budget Committees.

Now, I don't get surprised by much around here these days, but I was shocked by this.

Our teachers and our students are watching, Madam Speaker. Two of them are my sisters, who are public school teachers in Massachusetts. I can't imagine how they feel knowing that someone who says the deadliest high school shooting in our Nation's history was a false flag operation; how they will feel if that person sits behind the dais of the Education and Labor Committee, or behind the dais of any committee.

Madam Speaker, serving on a committee is not a right, it is a privilege, and when someone encourages violence against a Member, they should lose that privilege.

Now, this is not a radical idea. When something like this happened in the past, party leadership on both sides stepped up and took action.

That is what happened with Democrat Bill Jefferson and Republican Steve King. We are here today because Minority Leader MCCARTHY does not have the courage to do what is right.

Now, I remember a time when Republican leaders had the courage to do what was right. Dealing with the likes of Steve King was not an isolated incident. In 1991, when the Republican Party contended with David Duke, a Holocaust-denying neo-Nazi and former KKK grand wizard, former President George H.W. Bush said: "He should be rejected for what he is and what he stands for."

David Duke was pushed out of the party and stripped of any credibility and recognition.

□ 1230

Even as recently as 2016, when Duke announced a run for the U.S. Senate, the then-Republican National Committee chairman said: "David Duke and his hateful bigotry have no place in the Republican Party."

Madam Speaker, that seems like forever ago. What happened? The party of Lincoln is becoming the party of violent conspiracy theories. And apparently, the leaders of the Republican

Party in the House today are not going to do a damn thing about it.

Now, I never thought I would say this, Madam Speaker, but I agree with MITCH MCCONNELL. The Senate minority leader this week called Congresswoman GREENE's embrace of conspiracy theories "a cancer for the Republican Party."

I would take it a step further. I think giving Congresswoman GREENE a megaphone on a standing committee would be a cancer on this entire Congress.

None of us get to decide who the voters send to Congress. But as Members of this body, it is our job to set the standard for the conduct of those who serve here, especially when they cross the line into violence.

The Republican talking point now seems to be: "I condemn Congresswoman GREENE's words, but . . ."

Madam Speaker, her words are indefensible, period. And we must act, not because it helps us or hurts them, but because it is the right thing to do for this institution and for America.

Is nothing beyond the pale? Is there nothing so depraved and so disgusting that my colleagues would not condemn it, not just with words but with action? Will they not draw the line at calling for the assassination of another Member of this body?

It is my understanding that Congresswoman GREENE got a standing ovation from many Members during their Conference meeting last night. Come on.

Who applauded the person who advocated putting a bullet in the head of the Speaker of House? Who applauded the person who said school shootings are a false flag operation? Who applauded the person who suggested that 9/11 was a hoax?

I would like to know. I would like to know exactly who on the other side believes that these sick ideas deserve a standing ovation. Could we see a show of hands, please?

When the history books are written, they will remember this moment. But more than that, we all have to live with ourselves. I could never live with myself if I did nothing here. This is not the time for any of us to just look the other way.

Now, I am actually hopeful that there are some Republican Members who are willing to stand up, join with us, and vote for this resolution because it is the right thing to do, partisanship be damned.

I challenge any one of my colleagues to take a moment and read what she has said and what she has posted and come down here and try to defend it. You can't. It is indefensible.

Congresswoman GREENE says this resolution could set a precedent for the future. I hope it does. Because if this isn't the bottom, then I don't know what the hell is.

I hope we are setting a clear standard for what we will not tolerate. Anyone who suggests putting a bullet in the head of a Member shouldn't serve on any committee, period.

This is the standard that we are setting here today, and I am betting it is a standard that the American people want us to uphold. This is where we draw the line, Madam Speaker. These words and actions are the worst I think I have ever seen, ever, in all my time here.

We should have the courage to pass this rule and the underlying resolution on a bipartisan basis, to stand up for what is right, to demand better from those who serve in this institution, and to demand more for the people that we represent.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, my good friend, Chairman MCGOVERN, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, today is a sad one for us, for me personally, for the Rules Committee, and for the entire House of Representatives. Today, we are meeting on an unprecedented resolution by the majority, removing a Member of the minority party from her committee assignments.

Now, before I continue, Madam Speaker, I want to be very clear that I find the comments made by the Representative in question before she was elected to Congress to be deeply offensive. Members of Congress are and should be held to a high standard. And if she spoke any of what has been reported while a Member of this body, her words would certainly not meet that standard.

But at last night's Republican Conference, Representative GREENE expressed regret for her past statements, which speaks to a problem with today's resolution. Representative GREENE is not being given the courtesy of a referral to the Ethics Committee, the body empowered to investigate the conduct of Members. She is not being given the same due process that is given to other Members before facing punishment by the House.

Why is it so hard for the majority to give a Republican Member due process before stripping her of her committees? That is all I asked the Rules Committee last night, which the majority rejected.

Today's resolution raises serious questions for this institution. Indeed, these questions have nothing to do with this particular Member at all. Instead, they are about the future of the institution. The action the majority is proposing to take today is not only premature but, in fact, unprecedented in the history of the House.

Madam Speaker, what the majority is really proposing to do today is establish a new standard for punishing Members for conduct before they ever became a Member. The majority is proposing to hold Members of Congress accountable for statements made before they were even a candidate for Congress.

This change opens up troubling questions about how we judge future Members of Congress and whether or not we, as an institution, should impose sanctions on Members for actions they took before they were even candidates for office.

Under this majority's new approach, could a Member be punished for statements they made 5 years ago? Ten years ago? Twenty years ago?

I would remind the majority that several of their own Members have engaged in activities or made comments that Republican Members find offensive and inappropriate. If the majority changes hands in the future, as it surely will at some point, how would the current majority feel if these Members are stripped of their committee assignments with no due process? My friends run the risk of setting off a tit-for-tat exchange of escalating partisan punishment and score-settling that could cripple the operation of the House now and well into the future.

But what has also never been done before in the history of the institution is this: The majority has never taken steps to exercise a veto over the minority's committee assignments. It has never been done, Madam Speaker.

I know my friend, Chairman MCGOVERN, attempted to point out some cases in yesterday's Rules Committee hearing to the contrary. But each of those cases he cited actually involved the party sanctioning their own Members. The majority exercising a veto over the minority's assignments has never happened before.

I would also like to point out that this is the same majority which raised no objections a week ago when this House unanimously approved resolutions on committee assignments.

In the past, the majority and minority have respected each other's rights to place Members on committees without interference. It has ultimately been the responsibility of each side to also hold their Members accountable for unacceptable behavior, including making decisions to remove Members from their committee assignments when warranted.

Indeed, Madam Speaker, Republicans have removed Members from committees in the past. I know. I have personally been part of those proceedings.

We can and will do so again, if necessary, but it will be done with due process and with the Members in question, whoever they may be, allowed to make their case. That is a simple standard of fair play and decency that the majority has decided not to extend to a Member of the minority in this case.

I truly believe that the majority claiming a new right to be able to exercise a veto over the minority's committee assignments will ultimately be dangerous for this institution. A change in norms away from an institution built on mutual consent and toward an institution where the majority

holds a veto power over everything, including committee assignments, is ultimately an institution that cannot function.

If one side feels the other should take corrective action for one of its Members and has failed to do so, then the bipartisan Ethics Committee exists to adjudicate matters related to the Code of Official Conduct. I believe it would be appropriate for the Ethics Committee to determine if a new standard relating to the actions taken by a Member of Congress before they are elected should be covered by the Code of Official Conduct and make the appropriate recommendations for the institution to guide us going forward.

I fear that doing anything other than this would send the institution down a precarious path. The Ethics Committee is the appropriate venue for considering claims of misconduct. That is traditionally what this institution has done when considering the conduct of an individual Member. I believe today it is appropriate to adhere to that norm.

Madam Speaker, the matter we are faced with is bigger than any one individual Member. It is about how we, as an institution, will continue to function in the future. I fear that if we open this particular Pandora's box, we will not like what happens next. I would strongly urge this House to consider an alternative course before it is too late.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I will respond to a couple of things my good friend, Mr. COLE, just said.

As he pointed out, in the past, Members were removed from committees as a result of the wishes of their party leaders. It did not go through the Ethics Committee.

The reason we are here is because, in this case, which seems very obvious to us, the Republican leadership chose not to act. In fact, they met last night, and they voted on whether to remove Congresswoman CHENEY from her position because she had the courage of her convictions and came down and voted her conscience. They didn't vote on this.

Again, let me also point out, with regard to the Ethics Committee, there is no Ethics Committee that exists quite yet because Republicans haven't appointed all of their Members to the Ethics Committee, so it doesn't even function at this particular point.

I would just also say that, listening to my good friend, he talks about all of this as if it is somehow ancient history. Well, the gentlewoman from Georgia, as we speak, continues to fundraise off these disturbing remarks.

I am not sure what she said to the Republican Conference last night, but just last night, she tweeted about raising \$175,000 off of this and said: "We

will not back down. We will never give up."

That is not contrition, Madam Speaker. I say that to my colleagues. That is doubling down and profiting.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I, too, have to agree with the ranking member of the Rules Committee that this does raise serious questions for our institution and assure him that this is not a move taken lightly, but our colleagues have left us no choice.

Historically, the parties have policed themselves. Even as recently as 2 years ago, our Republican colleagues removed a Member from committees after he made a series of false and despicable statements, which were less serious than the conduct we consider here.

But, apparently, that was the old GOP. In the words of Republican Senator JOHN THUNE from South Dakota, the party of "limited government and fiscal responsibility, free markets, peace through strength" has become the "party of conspiracy theories and QAnon."

No matter how much our colleagues here today say that they disapprove of the conduct of the Representative from Georgia, they must realize that she is now the face of their party.

If today's House Republican caucus wants to embrace this behavior, the majority does not. The Member in question has advocated for insurrection and violence against elected officials and children, has challenged the safety of Members and our Capitol Police, and has promoted fringe conspiracy theories that damage our work.

Such behavior would not be tolerated in any other workplace, and it cannot be tolerated in the people's House.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle know this. While they have been careful to distance themselves from their Member's remarks and actions, they have not shown the courage to hold a Member of their own party accountable when they don't have the shield of a secret vote.

They force us to take this action to stop the spread of conspiracy theories, lies, and hate in the Halls of Congress.

This isn't canceling the Representative from Georgia's voice. It is about accountability. There is no right to committee assignments, but if a Member conducts himself or herself in so disgraceful a way that she brings discredit upon Congress, and her own party cannot address the problem, then the House, as a whole, has to deal with it.

I urge my colleagues to recognize what the public has recognized in a bipartisan manner, that the indecent behavior of this Member is a threat to Congress and our government.

□ 1245

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just for informational purposes.

There is no way my friend from Massachusetts could have known this, but last night the Republican members were formally named to the Ethics Committee. We expect them to be approved today so the committee could function immediately. But, again, my friend would have had no way of knowing that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE).

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, to my Democrat colleagues, to my Republican colleagues, to my district back home in Georgia 14, to the American people, to my mom and dad, and to my husband and my children:

I have been here for 1 month and 1 day, and I have gotten to know part of my conference—my Republican colleagues—but not even all of them yet. I haven't gotten to know any of my Democrat colleagues, and I haven't had any conversations with any of you to tell you who I am and what I am about. You only know me by how Media Matters, CNN, MSNBC, and the rest of the mainstream media is portraying me.

What you don't know about me is that I am a very proud wife of almost 25 years and that I am a mother of three children. I consider being a mother the greatest blessing of my life and the greatest thing that I will ever achieve. I am proudly the first person to graduate college in my family, making my parents very happy and proud. I am also a very successful businessowner. We have grown our company from one State to 11 States. I am a very hard worker. I have always paid my taxes. I have never been arrested. I have never done drugs. But I have gotten a few speeding tickets in my day.

What you need to know about me is I am a very regular American, just like the people I represent in my district and most people across the country. I never, ever considered to run for Congress or even get involved in politics. As a matter of fact, I wasn't a political person until I found a candidate that I really liked, and his name is Donald J. Trump, when he ran for President.

To me, he was someone I could relate to, someone that I enjoyed his plain talk; not the offensive things, but just the way he talked normally. And I thought, finally, maybe this is someone who will do something about the things that deeply bother me, like the fact that we are so deeply in debt, that our country has murdered over 62 million people in the womb, that our borders are open and some of my friends have had their children murdered by illegal aliens. Or perhaps that maybe we can stop sending our sons and daughters to fight in foreign wars and be used as the world's police basically. Or maybe that our Government would stand up for our American businesses and our American jobs and make the American people and the American taxpayers their focus. These are the things that I care about deeply.

So when we elected President Trump, and then I started seeing things in the news that didn't make sense to me—like Russian collusion, which are conspiracy theories also and have been proven so—these things bothered me deeply. I realized that just watching CNN or FOX News, I may not find the truth.

So what I did was I started looking up things on the internet, asking questions, like most people do every day, use Google. I stumbled across something—and this was at the end of 2017—called QAnon. Well, these posts were mainly about this Russian collusion information. A lot of it was some of what I would see on the news at night, and I got very interested in it. So I posted about it on Facebook, I read about it, I talked about it, I asked questions about it. And then more information came from it.

But, you see, here's the problem: Throughout 2018, I was upset about things and didn't trust the Government really because the people here weren't doing the things that I thought they should be doing for us, the things that I just told you I cared about. And I want you to know that a lot of Americans don't trust our Government, and that is sad. The problem with that is, though, I was allowed to believe things that weren't true, and I would ask questions about them and talk about them.

And that is absolutely what I regret because, if it weren't for the Facebook posts and comments that I liked in 2018, I wouldn't be standing here today and you couldn't point a finger and accuse me of anything wrong, because I have lived a very good life that I am proud of, my family is proud of, my husband is proud of, my children are proud of. And that is what my district elected me for.

So later in 2018, when I started finding misinformation, lies, things that were not true in these QAnon posts, I stopped believing it. And I want to tell you—and I say this to everyone—any source of information that is a mix of truth and a mix of lies is dangerous, no matter what it is saying, what party it is helping, anything, or any country it is about. It is dangerous. And these are the things that happen on the left and the right. And it is a true problem in our country.

So I walked away from those things and I decided that I am going to do what I have done all my life: I am going to work hard and try to solve the problems that I am upset about. So I started getting involved in politics.

You see, school shootings are absolutely real. Every child that is lost, those families mourn it. I understand how terrible it is because when I was 16 years old, in 11th grade, my school was a gun-free school zone, and one of my schoolmates brought guns to school and took our entire school hostage, and that happened right down the hall from my classroom. I know the fear that David Hogg had that day. I know the

fear that these kids have. And I say this sincerely with all my heart because I love our kids, every single one of your children, all of our children: This is why I truly believe that children at school should never be left unprotected. I believe they should be just as protected as we were with 30,000 National Guardsmen. Our children are our future and they are our most precious resource.

I also want to tell you that 9/11 absolutely happened. I remember that day, crying all day long, watching it on the news. And it is a tragedy for anyone to say it didn't happen. So I definitely want to tell you that I do not believe that it is fake.

I also want to tell you that we have to do better. You see, big media companies can take teeny tiny pieces of words that I have said, that you have said, any of us have said, and can portray us into someone that we are not, and that is wrong.

Cancel culture is a real thing. It is very real. And with big tech companies like Twitter, you can scroll through and see where someone may have retweeted porn. This is a problem. This is a terrible, terrible thing. Yet when I say that I absolutely believe with all my heart that God's creation is he created the male and female and that should not be denied, when I am censored for saying those type of things, that is wrong.

You see, here's the real situation: I decided to run for Congress because I wanted to help our country. I want Americans to have our American Dream. I want to protect our freedoms. This is what I ran for Congress on.

I never once said QAnon during my entire campaign. I never once said during my campaign any of the things that I am being accused of today. I never said any of these things since I have been elected for Congress. These were words of the past. These things do not represent me. They do not represent my district. They do not represent my values.

Here's what I can tell you: I am beyond grateful for this opportunity. And I will tell you why. I believe in God with all my heart. I am so grateful to be humbled, to be reminded that I am a sinner and that Jesus died on the cross to forgive me for my sins. This is something that I absolutely rejoice in today to tell you all. I think it is important for all of us to remember that none of us are perfect. None of us are. None of us can even come close to earning our way into Heaven just by our acts and our works, but it is only through the grace of God.

This is why I will tell you as a Member of this Congress—the 117th Congress: I am a passionate person. I am a competitor. I am a fighter. I will work with you for good things for the people of this country.

But the things I will not stand for is abortion. I think it is the worst thing this country has ever committed. And if we are to say, "In God we trust,"

how do we murder God's creation in the womb?

Another thing I will say to this body is I want to work with all of you for our people. It should be America first always. Always. There is nothing wrong with that.

If this Congress is to tolerate Members that condone riots that have hurt American people, attacked police officers, occupied Federal property, burned businesses and cities, yet wants to condemn me and crucify me in the public square for words that I said—and I regret—a few years ago, then I think we are in a real big problem, a very big problem.

What shall we do as Americans? Shall we stay divided like this? Will we allow the media, that is just as guilty as QAnon of presenting truth and lies, to divide us? Will we allow ourselves to be addicted to hate and hating one another?

I hope not, because that is not the future I want for my children and it is not the future I want for any of your children.

Mr. MCGOVERN. First of all, Madam Speaker, to equate the media to QAnon is beyond the pale.

Secondly, the gentlewoman said that she now believes that 9/11 really happened. But let me just read a quote. At the conservative American Priority Conference, she said: "It's odd there's never any evidence shown for a plane in the Pentagon, but anyways, I won't—I won't—I'm not going to dive into the 9/11 conspiracy."

Now, granted, that was in 2018, and the gentlewoman just told us that, in 2018, she had an epiphany and decided not to follow these conspiracy theories anymore.

But then, in 2019, she claims that Speaker PELOSI is guilty of treason, and then she said: "It's a crime punishable by death is what treason is. NANCY PELOSI is guilty of treason."

That is 2019. Also in 2019, she liked a comment on social media that advocated a bullet to the head of Speaker PELOSI.

Also in 2019, in an interview, she called a student survivor of the Parkland massacre, "Very trained. He is like a dog." And then she said that he was an idiot who only talked when he is scripted.

Also in 2019, you know, on the Grounds of the Capitol complex, Representative GREENE followed a survivor of the Parkland massacre, calling him a coward; and then when he ignored her shouted questions, she said: He can't say a word because he can't defend his stance.

I mean, that is 2019.

Now, we could be here all week going over comments and posts in 2019 and in 2020. So, you know, I just have to say that I did not hear a disavowment or an apology for those things. I did not hear an apology or denouncement for the claim, the insinuation that political opponents should be violently dealt with. I didn't hear anybody

apologize or retract the anti-Semitic and Islamophobic remarks that have been made and that have been posted over and over and over again. Again, the gentlewoman's campaign has profited off of these hurtful remarks and these dangerous statements. So I just point that out for the RECORD.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT), my very good friend.

□ 1300

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, this morning, as many of you, I was watching the National Day of Prayer. While watching, I was reading an opinion piece in Baptist News and this message stuck out to me as relevant to today's debate: Whoever has the power, makes the rules; whoever makes the rules, makes them in their favor.

Madam Speaker, I want you to know that I read that before I saw your prayer, which I thought was a wonderful closing prayer.

I would point out, some others who don't share our faith may not. I thought it was wonderful and that is the First Amendment that we get to enjoy in this country, and I thank you for that prayer.

I rise today in opposition to H. Res. 72 and efforts by the majority to remove a member of the minority party from their committee assignments.

This resolution—and I think this is important—was introduced 3 days ago to the Ethics Committee, but it was brought to the floor without so much as a hearing before the Ethics Committee.

Now I want to stress, the past remarks or emojis that you bring up of our colleague do not represent the values of our Conference nor of my home State of Georgia. I expressed that in her primary and I continue to express that today.

But if this was about the remarks our colleague made, you would put a resolution on the floor condemning those remarks. But no matter what those remarks are or how bad they are, she and every other Member in this body should be entitled to due process just as every other American is entitled to due process. And in this case, it would be before the Ethics Committee before it came to the floor of the House.

But let's be honest about what this is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Georgia an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, you have a 10-vote margin in this body. This body has 20 standing committees. You created a proxy voting system that allows your Members to stay at home while the Republican Members show up for work

and you have another resolution that you haven't discussed yet to remove over 100 Republican Members of Congress, including 6 from my home State of Georgia.

Do you really think that we believe that you are going to stop with the gentlewoman from the 14th Congressional District, Mrs. MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE? We know better. We know better. The truth of the matter is you have got a math problem in passing your agenda.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just tell my colleague from Georgia—I can't resist because he mentioned proxy voting. I hate to tell him, but a lot of Republicans are voting by proxy, too. So the same ones who condemned it are the ones who are now utilizing it.

And, again, I would remind the gentleman that this is not a criminal trial. And that when the Republicans removed Steve King from his committees, there was no Ethics Committee deliberation on that. The decision was made to remove Steve King because finally, at long last, there was a realization that embracing white supremacy was unacceptable.

When Bill Jefferson, a Democrat, was removed by Democrats, again, removed from his committees, there wasn't an Ethics Committee deliberation. It was a decision that our leadership made and there was bipartisan support for that as well.

Now, we can sit here all we want and try to make excuses for not taking action. I mean, I think the standard here is, Republicans are coming to the floor and saying: We don't want to associate ourselves with these remarks. We condemn these remarks, but we don't appreciate any references to violence, and we don't appreciate any references to anti-Semitism, but . . .

I mean, but, but, but, but. And here we are.

And so the issue here is that the Republican Conference last night met to really deliberate on the fate of Congresswoman CHENEY. They didn't take a vote on this. And, basically, by doing nothing, what does that message send?

How refreshing it would be, how welcome it would be if there was a strong, bipartisan vote on this resolution. Imagine what that would mean to the American people to know that we were all unified on the issue of when a Member, when a person who serves in this House has advocated the use of violence, called for assassinations, that we all agree that that is so unacceptable that, at a minimum, they ought not to have the privilege of being on a committee.

And I am not sure we are going to get that kind of unity here today, but I hope we do. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, just quickly, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, just to respond to my friend briefly, remember, we are doing something here that has never been done before. The majority is taking away a committee assignment of the minority. That has not happened in this House before.

Also remember, we are applying, or you were choosing to apply the code of official conduct to a Member before they were ever a Member. That has not, to my knowledge, ever been done before either.

We haven't said: Let's do nothing. We have said: These are pretty serious questions. Let's go to the Ethics Committee, adjudicate them, have a discussion, and have a recommendation come back out.

So to say we don't want to do something is just simply inaccurate. I think you are, frankly, overlooking the unprecedented nature of the acts that you have decided upon, and where that may lead us when the majority changes.

So with that, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I find myself sort of the oldest freshman in my class returning after just a 2-year hiatus and finding a House that I am having a hard time understanding how it got so bad in such a short period of time.

As my colleague on the other side of the aisle aptly said, we have had to remove people for cause in this body. When I was a freshman some 20 years ago, we removed Jim Traficant because he had been tried and convicted and still wouldn't resign.

We have stripped people of their committees when they have been indicted and ensured that they left this body when they were convicted.

But we have not and should not, in fact, hold people responsible for actions before the people of their home State elected them and their Secretary of State certified them, and they came here. In so doing, we could pick a plethora of people not to seat or not to give committees to.

On the other side of the aisle, there is a gentleman who I respect whom I have served with for my entire time in Congress who was impeached and removed from office by this very body and, yet, has served honorably here for more than two decades and sits at a high position on many committees.

After the Civil War, in time, there were people who had been Confederate soldiers who came here as Congressmen. In fact, the famous Senator Byrd was a grand wizard of the Ku Klux Klan before he was a member of these bodies.

We cannot and should not judge people by what they have done before they arrive, and we should not tell the minority who they can seat. You may shame us, you may disparage us if we give somebody a committee assignment, but that is part of free speech.

In closing, if we do this, it will be no different than when John Adams allowed for a Member—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from California an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, when a member of this body was incarcerated for something that John Adams felt was injurious to him under the Sedition Act, it was retroactive. He had written it before the act was passed and the act was, in fact, not in keeping with our free speech.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me, again, just respond by reminding the gentleman that this isn't an issue because of political differences on policy. It just isn't.

I mean, I remind him, Representative GREENE, in January 2019 on her social media, liked a comment that advocated a bullet to the head of the Speaker of the House. That doesn't bother you? That doesn't give you pause? Because there is a whole bunch of those kinds of posts on her social media.

Is there anything that is so awful that will give you pause?

I mean, we heard Mrs. GREENE. She came down here and we heard 10 minutes of whataboutism and conspiracy, you know, and comparing American journalists to violent QAnon extremists. She was basically saying it is not her fault—it is everybody else's fault—not taking personal responsibility, and really not apologizing for any of these really offensive things.

And so this is one of these moments of truth as to, you know, what do we think about this institution? I mean, I really do think this is a vote about the integrity of this institution, and about upholding a standard of decency. And, quite frankly, we were all hoping you would do it. You do the right thing.

But, apparently, I think a political decision was made that it is advantageous not to alienate certain types of voters in this country even if they think the way and advocate for the policies and ideas that Mrs. GREENE has put forward. That is what this is about.

And I know I talked to many of my colleagues on the other side. I know many are very uncomfortable and very offended by what she has said and what she has posted, but apparently not offended or uncomfortable enough to actually take action. And I think that that is unfortunate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the distinguished Republican whip of the Congress and my good friend.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I have been clear for a long time that the comments made

by Mrs. GREENE prior to being elected a Member of Congress are completely inappropriate and, in fact, I have spoken directly to her to express that. And we had a long conversation, frankly, similar to the one that we just heard on the floor a few minutes ago, Madam Speaker, where we heard Mrs. GREENE herself come and give a full account of things she has done in her past.

In fact, at the end, she said: Jesus died on the cross to forgive me of my sins. She has actually held herself to account as many of us have as well.

I wonder if that same new standard that is being talked about today is anticipated to be applied equally by the majority's side to people who have done things egregious and haven't given account and, in fact, on those things, as sitting Members of Congress, not what happened in 2018, 2019, that we all decry.

But, Madam Speaker, if the things that happened in 2018 and 2019 were so egregious that they warrant the unprecedented step of removing a Member of Congress from all committees by the majority party against someone in the minority party, if that was so egregious, why then did not a single Democrat object to that last week when that issue came before this Congress on this floor and she was added to those committees?

This is the resolution that added her to the committees. Not a single Democrat last week—not in 2018 or 2019—last week, not a single Democrat objected. But now this new standard seems to be applied.

This morning, we continued a great tradition in this Congress, the National Prayer Breakfast, where Republicans and Democrats come together and leaders from the entire world come together to pray. Today, things like forgiveness were freely discussed.

I want to read John 8:7.

So when they continued asking Him, He lifted up Himself, and said unto them, He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her.

Madam Speaker, we need to stop casting stones at each other and rise to the level where we are going to start spending every day on this House floor, not fighting battles of the past but fighting for the hardworking families of this country who are counting on us to come together.

I ask that the leadership withdraw this resolution and let's get back to work for the American people.

□ 1315

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, let me say to the gentleman who just spoke that I do believe that the standard that we are upholding today should be viewed equally for everybody. If any Member of this Chamber has advocated for the execution of another Member, whether it is a Democrat or a Republican, I will join with everybody here in advocating that

they be taken off their committees. I have said that over and over and over again.

Madam Speaker, is that a controversial idea, that if people advocate that kind of stuff, that somehow we are going to look the other way or we are going to move on and let's not even talk about it?

And I will remind the gentleman that this is not ancient history. She continues to fundraise off this stuff. Read her social media. I am sure you do. So, come on.

And then I am a little confused because the gentleman was saying we shouldn't be doing this today, we should have done it last week when there was a unanimous consent request to basically move forward a whole bunch of committee assignments—Democrats and Republicans forward.

I mean, the deal is, if we had taken that down, then a whole bunch of people would be without committee assignments, as we speak. We have a lot of work to do to get this economy on the right track and crush this virus, especially in the aftermath of the 4 years we have been through.

Madam Speaker, we all want to move forward. We all want to move on. But you can't move forward unless there is some accounting here, unless there is some reckoning with what all of this means. And I would think that for the sake of this institution, if we want to uphold the standard of decency in this institution, that we will all come together on this.

Madam Speaker, what we just heard from Mrs. GREENE was not an apology. And if that was the speech that was given last night in the Republican Conference, I guess my question would be: And that got a standing ovation?

I didn't hear an apology for the incredibly dangerous and hurtful remarks that she has made. I didn't hear an explanation for why she is still fundraising off of these terrible things here.

Madam Speaker, I don't know what my colleagues found so convincing, but I stand here today still deeply, deeply troubled and offended by the things that she has posted and the things that she has said and still not taken responsibility for and still not apologized for.

And the idea of coming to the floor and basically saying: Well, it is the media's fault, it is this person's fault or that person's fault—and that the American media is equivalent to the violent QAnon extremists, well, I got to tell you, just when you think you have heard everything, then you hear that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, just quickly for the RECORD, so my friend knows, the resolution that the Republican whip, Mr. SCALISE, was referring to just a few minutes ago only concerned Republicans. So if you wanted to object to Republicans, that is what you could

have done. It didn't involve Democrats at all.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to amend House rules to state that any resolution proposing to remove a Member from a committee assignment shall not be in order unless offered by, or with the concurrence of, the leader of the party of the Member that is the subject of the resolution.

Madam Speaker, this speaks to a norm of basic fairness that today's resolution does not comply with. In the past, the majority has never attempted to exercise a veto over the minority's committee assignments, nor has the minority ever attempted to do the same to the majority.

This has been, in the past, an unwritten rule, a norm the House has adhered to in order to protect the operations of the institution. But the majority's actions today threaten that norm and threaten to set off a new round of escalating partisan punishment anytime the majority changes hands. Enshrining historical practice as a new rule is an important step to protect the institution as a whole.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I respond by saying to the gentleman: We have been waiting. We have been Members now for over a month in this new Congress, and we have been waiting for action. I guess we got the answer last night: A standing ovation for somebody who has said and posted what Mrs. GREENE has said and posted. I mean, that is the response. We have waited, and now we are going to move forward with this action.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, just in response to my good friend: I was actually there. So, number one, she didn't get a standing ovation for things that she said. She got a standing ovation for regretting things that she had said, and saying she has been wrong, and denouncing QAnon and denouncing school shootings. That is what she got the standing ovation for. My friend didn't have the opportunity to hear that. I wanted to take the opportunity to inform him.

Madam Speaker, I would advise my friend that I am prepared to close.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I oppose the rule. Never before in the history of

this institution has the majority attempted to exercise a veto over the minority's right to make committee assignments, yet, today, the majority is choosing to do just that. This leads the institution down a dangerous path, the end of which we cannot see.

Madam Speaker, there are alternative paths open that I believe the House should consider. We owe it to ourselves and to the institution to do so. Before we strip a Member of their committees for remarks that person made before they were subject to the official rules of conduct of the House, maybe we ought to have a discussion about that, if we are going to extend that in a way we never have before in the institution. I am not necessarily against that, by the way. I think that is a worthy topic.

I also think that if we are going to strip a Member before they ever served on a committee, they ought to have an opportunity to tell their side of the story in a judicious proceeding. Our Committee on Ethics has resolved a lot of naughty issues in a very bipartisan way, and not with Members escaping punishment. So to say we have asked for nothing be done, it is quite the opposite.

We have said: Let's go to the Committee on Ethics.

Let's hash through these tough issues of changing the scope of the official conduct provisions of the House that applies to Members.

Let's talk about whether or not it is appropriate for the majority to actually try to dictate the people that the minority puts on committees.

And, finally, let's give a Member that we accuse of something an opportunity to make his or her case.

That is what we have asked for, and that is what the majority has chosen not to do.

Madam Speaker, I think it is a dangerous mistake. It is a mistake that, frankly, when the majority changes, the temptation will be overwhelming for a Member to say: "Oh, well, there is a Member I didn't like or said something or did something I didn't like. As a Member, I think I am just going to take that committee assignment away."

I can give you a list of people that have done things that I think are inappropriate, on both sides of the aisle, quite frankly. But we have never done that here, and I don't think we should start doing that here. All we have asked for is a process, a Committee on Ethics discussion. We think that is the appropriate way to proceed.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, "no" on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this is a very serious matter, and I appreciate my ranking member, Mr. COLE, for the way he conducts himself because I know he

cares deeply about this institution, and he knows that I admire him greatly.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) was on the floor, and he quoted the Bible. And I have read the Bible, too, I want to inform the gentleman. And I believe in the Jesuit tradition.

Apology is not just words, it is action. And I didn't hear Mrs. GREENE do that today. I heard a lot about whataboutisms, but I didn't hear her take responsibility, nor did I hear her apologize for some of the most egregious things that she has posted and said.

I also point out for the record—because I think this is important—I am not convinced her memory is 100 percent accurate here on some things. Here, just now—and she spoke to the whole Chamber—she said she didn't discuss QAnon during her campaign.

Madam Speaker, but last July, she said in her local interview: "I've only ever seen patriotic sentiment coming out of that source." And she wouldn't answer if she was still a follower.

So I am a little confused that she is now trying to denounce QAnon, yet she said recently that they are patriots. She said: Never seen anything other than patriotic sentiment coming out of that source.

QAnon is a dangerous, sick cult. Period. And nobody—certainly nobody in this Chamber—should ever, in any way, shape, or form, try to associate themselves with them. They are not patriotic individuals. They are pushing sick, dangerous, violent conspiracy theories. Many of the people who attacked this Chamber on January 6 had their QAnon flags and insignias. So give me a break.

Madam Speaker, I don't know what it is going to take for some here to act. And I will just repeat what I said earlier. I don't know what the hell happened to the Republican Party. The party of Lincoln, the party of Eisenhower, the party of Reagan is becoming the party of MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE and the party of violent conspiracy theories.

If anyone has any question about the things that she has said or done—anybody who is watching—just spend a moment and look at her social media posts. Don't take my word for it. Go research it for yourself. Google it. It is all there. They go well beyond anything that we have seen from any Member in this body.

Encouraging violence against another Member;

Posting and saying that 9/11 was a hoax;

That school shootings were planned by gun safety advocates;

Spreading anti-Semitic and anti-Muslim conspiracies and hate speech.

It is all there. We are not just saying this. It is there.

Madam Speaker, now, I am a big believer of the Committee on Ethics's process, but I don't need an investigation to tell me what I can read with my own eyes. The only question is this: What are we going to do about it?

Just as there was bipartisan agreement that Congressman KING had no business on a committee, there should be bipartisan agreement that Congresswoman GREENE doesn't either.

The only reason this is taking a resolution on the floor today is that Leader MCCARTHY is unwilling to apply that same standard here. A stern conversation is not enough. We aren't talking about expulsion here today. Though, some think that that is warranted, but that is not what we are talking about. We are deciding whether someone who has encouraged violence against Members should be given a platform on a standing committee. That is what the topic is here today.

And I have to say, I didn't even know that was a question. I assume the answer was obvious, but apparently it is not to some here.

Madam Speaker, inaction is complicity. We must set a standard of conduct in this institution and ensure that the violence, conspiracy theories, and the lies that we see on the darkest corners of the internet don't get a platform on a standing committee here in the House of Representatives.

Madam Speaker, I hope my colleagues will vote their conscience. I hope my colleagues will do what is right for the institution. This is about the institution, about who we are. Again, for the life of me, I don't understand what is complicated here, what is giving people hesitation.

We know the results of these violent conspiracy theorists. We saw that on January 6. We know what it leads to. I don't ever want to see that again. And we all should make clear where we stand on this. So Congresswoman GREENE coming here and speaking for 10 minutes and not taking responsibility for any of this stuff, trying to make us believe that she doesn't believe in QAnon anymore—I just pointed to an interview that was fairly recent—not apologizing for the most egregious comments that she has posted.

Madam Speaker, we have to be better than this. This can't be the future. And I am hoping that we will get a bipartisan vote here because I do think, as I said before, a strong bipartisan vote on this, what a refreshing signal that would be to the American people that all of us together are standing up against hate, against violence, against conspiracy theories; that we are together on this. This shouldn't be hard.

The material previously referred to by Mr. COLE is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 91

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert the following:

“That clause 5(a)(1) of rule X is amended by designating the existing text as subdivision (A) and adding the following new subdivisions:

“(B) A resolution proposing to remove a Member from a committee shall not be in order unless offered by, or with the concurrence of, the Leader of the party of the Member that is the subject of the resolution.”.

“(C) The Committee on Rules may not report a rule or order that waives the application of subdivision (B).”.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 209, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—218

Adams	Golden	Neguse
Agullar	Gomez	Newman
Allred	Gonzalez,	Norcross
Auchincloss	Vicente	O'Halleran
Axne	Gottheimer	Ocasio-Cortez
Barragán	Green, Al (TX)	Omar
Bass	Grijalva	Pallone
Beatty	Harder (CA)	Panetta
Bera	Hastings	Pappas
Beyer	Hayes	Pascarella
Bishop (GA)	Higgins (NY)	Payne
Blumenauer	Himes	Perlmutter
Blunt Rochester	Horsford	Peters
Bonamici	Houlihan	Phillips
Bourdeaux	Hoyer	Pingree
Bowman	Huffman	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan F.	Jackson Lee	Porter
Brown	Jacobs (CA)	Pressley
Brownley	Jayapal	Price (NC)
Bush	Jeffries	Quigley
Bustos	Johnson (GA)	Raskin
Butterfield	Johnson (TX)	Rice (NY)
Carbajal	Jones	Ross
Cárdenas	Kahele	Roybal-Allard
Carson	Kaptur	Ruiz
Cartwright	Keating	Ruppersberger
Case	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Casten	Khanna	Ryan
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Sánchez
Castro (TX)	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Chu	Kim (NJ)	Scanlon
Cicilline	Kind	Schakowsky
Clark (MA)	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Cleaver	Kuster	Schrader
Clyburn	Lamb	Schrier
Cohen	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sewell
Correa	Lawrence	Sherman
Costa	Lawson (FL)	Sherrill
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Sires
Craig	Lee (NV)	Slotkin
Crist	Leger Fernandez	Smith (WA)
Crow	Levin (CA)	Soto
Cuellar	Levin (MI)	Spanberger
Davids (KS)	Lieu	Speier
Davis, Danny K.	Lofgren	Stanton
Dean	Lowenthal	Stevens
DeFazio	Luria	Strickland
DeGette	Lynch	Suozzi
DeLauro	Malinowski	Swalwell
DelBene	Maloney,	Takano
Delgado	Carolyn B.	Thompson (CA)
Demings	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	Manning	Titus
Deutsch	Matsui	Tlaib
Dingell	McBath	Tonko
Doggett	McCollum	Torres (CA)
Doyle, Michael F.	McEachin	Torres (NY)
Escobar	McGovern	Trahan
Eshoo	McNerney	Trone
Españillat	Meeks	Underwood
Evans	Meng	Vargas
Fletcher	Mfume	Veasey
Foster	Moore (WI)	Vela
Frankel, Lois	Morelle	Velázquez
Gallego	Moulton	Wasserman
Garamendi	Mrvan	Schultz
García (IL)	Murphy (FL)	Waters
García (TX)	Nadler	Watson Coleman
	Napolitano	
	Neal	

Welch
Wexton

Wild
Williams (GA)
NAYS—209

Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Aderholt	Gonzales, Tony	Moolenaar
Allen	Gonzalez (OH)	Mooney
Amodei	Good (VA)	Moore (AL)
Armstrong	Gooden (TX)	Moore (UT)
Arrington	Gosar	Mullin
Babin	Granger	Murphy (NC)
Bacon	Graves (LA)	Nehls
Baird	Graves (MO)	Newhouse
Balderson	Green (TN)	Norman
Banks	Greene (GA)	Nunes
Barr	Griffith	Oberholte
Bentz	Grothman	Owens
Bergman	Guest	Palazzo
Bice (OK)	Guthrie	Palmer
Biggs	Hagedorn	Pence
Bilirakis	Harris	Perry
Bishop (NC)	Harshbarger	Pfleger
Boebert	Hartzler	Posey
Bost	Hern	Reed
Brady	Herrell	Reschenthaler
Brooks	Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)
Buchanan	Hice (GA)	Rodgers (WA)
Buck	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Bucshon	Hill	Rogers (KY)
Budd	Hinson	Rose
Burchett	Hollingsworth	Rosendale
Burgess	Hudson	Rouzer
Calvert	Huizenga	Roy
Cammack	Issa	Rutherford
Carl	Jackson	Salazar
Carter (GA)	Jacobs (NY)	Scalise
Carter (TX)	Johnson (LA)	Schweikert
Cawthorn	Johnson (OH)	Scott, Austin
Chabot	Johnson (SD)	Sessions
Cheney	Jordan	Simpson
Cline	Joyce (OH)	Smith (MO)
Cloud	Joyce (PA)	Smith (NE)
Clyde	Katko	Smith (NJ)
Cole	Keller	Smucker
Comer	Kelly (MS)	Spartz
Crawford	Kelly (PA)	Stauber
Crenshaw	Kim (CA)	Steel
Curtis	Kinzinger	Stefanik
Davidson	Kustoff	Steil
DesJarlais	LaHood	Steube
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Stewart
Donalds	Lamborn	Stivers
Duncan	Latta	Taylor
Dunn	LaTurner	Thompson (PA)
Emmer	Lesko	Tiffany
Estes	Long	Timmons
Fallon	Loudermilk	Turner
Feenstra	Lucas	Upton
Ferguson	Luetkemeyer	Valadao
Fischbach	Mace	Van Drew
Fitzgerald	Malliotakis	Van Dyne
Fitzpatrick	Mann	Wagner
Fleischmann	Massie	Walberg
Fortenberry	Mast	Walorski
Fox	McCarthy	Waltz
Franklin, C.	McCaul	Weber (TX)
Scott	McClain	Webster (FL)
Fulcher	McClintock	Wenstrup
Gaetz	McHenry	Westerman
Gallagher	McKinley	Williams (TX)
Garbarino	Meijer	Wilson (SC)
García (CA)	Meuser	Wittman
Gibbs	Miller (IL)	Womack
Gimenez	Miller (WV)	Young
Gohmert	Miller-Meeks	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—4

□ 1423

Mr. FEENSTRA changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 22.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Axne (Stevens)	Bowman (Clark (MA))	Boyle, Brendan F. (Jeffries)
Barragán (Beyer)		

Buchanan (Arrington)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
Carson (Butterfield)
Cohen (Beyer)
Cooper (Clark (MA))
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
Fallon (Nehls)
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))
Gallego (Gomez)
Gonzalez, Vincente (Gomez)
Gosar (Wagner)
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)
Jayapal (Clark (MA))

Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Langevin (Courtney)
Larson (CT) (Courtney)
Lawrence (Kildee)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Long (Wagner)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Lynch (Clark (MA))
Maloney, Carolyn B. (Jeffries)
McEachin (Wexton)
McHenry (Banks)
Meng (Clark (MA))

Mfume (Brown)
Moulton (Beyer)
Napolitano (Correa)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Porter (Wexton)
Price (NC) (Butterfield)
Roybal-Allard (Correa)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Speier (Scanlon)
Titus (Connolly)
Trahan (McGovern)
Vela (Gomez)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Adams)

Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader

Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suzoi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib

Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

□ 1522

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Axne (Stevens)	Hastings (Wasserman)	McHenry (Banks)
Barragán (Beyer)	Schultz (MA))	Meng (Clark)
Bowman (Clark (MA))	Jayapal (Clark (MA))	Mfume (Brown)
Boyle, Brendan F. (Jeffries)	Kirkpatrick (Stanton)	Moulton (Beyer)
Buchanan (Arrington)	Langevin	Napolitano (Correa)
Cárdenas (Gomez)	(Courtney)	Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Carson (Butterfield)	Larson (CT)(Courtney)	Porter (Wexton)
Cohen (Beyer)	Lawrence (Kildee)	Price (NC)
Cooper (Clark (MA))	Lawson (FL)(Evans)	Roybal-Allard (Correa)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Lieu (Beyer)	Ruiz (Aguilar)
Fallon (Nehls)	Lofgren (Jeffries)	Rush (Underwood)
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))	Long (Wagner)	Speier (Scanlon)
Gallego (Gomez)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Titus (Connolly)
Gonzalez, Vincente (Gomez)	Lynch (Clark (MA))	Trahan (McGovern)
Gosar (Wagner)	Maloney, Carolyn B. (Jeffries)	Vela (Gomez)
	McEachin (Wexton)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
		Wilson (FL) (Adams)

NAYS—210

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Mast
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert

Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Tiffany
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 210, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

YEAS—218

Adams	DelBene	Krishnamoorthi
Aguilar	Delgado	Kuster
Allred	Demings	Lamb
Auchincloss	DeSaulnier	Langevin
Axne	Deutch	Larsen (WA)
Barragán	Dingell	Larson (CT)
Bass	Doggett	Lawrence
Beatty	Doyle, Michael F.	Lawson (FL)
Bera	Escobar	Lee (CA)
Beyer	Eshoo	Lee (NV)
Bishop (GA)	Españillat	Leger Fernandez
Blumenauer	Evans	Levin (CA)
Blunt Rochester	Fletcher	Levin (MI)
Bonamici	Foster	Lieu
Bourdeaux	Frankel, Lois	Lofgren
Bowman	Gallego	Lowenthal
Boyle, Brendan F.	Garamendi	Luria
Brown	Garcia (IL)	Lynch
Brownley	Garcia (TX)	Malinowski
Bush	Golden	Maloney, Carolyn B.
Bustos	Gomez	Maloney, Sean
Butterfield	Gonzalez, Vicente	Manning
Carbajal	Gottheimer	Matsui
Cárdenas	Green, Al (TX)	McBath
Carson	Grijalva	McCollum
Cartwright	Harder (CA)	McEachin
Case	Hastings	McGovern
Casten	Hayes	McNerney
Castor (FL)	Higgins (NY)	Meeks
Castro (TX)	Himes	Meng
Chu	Horsford	Mfume
Cicilline	Houlihan	Moore (WI)
Clark (MA)	Hoyer	Morelle
Clarke (NY)	Huffman	Moulton
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Mrvan
Clyburn	Jacobs (CA)	Murphy (FL)
Cohen	Jayapal	Nadler
Connolly	Jeffries	Napolitano
Cooper	Johnson (GA)	Neal
Correa	Johnson (TX)	Neguse
Costa	Jones	Newman
Courtney	Kahele	Norcross
Craig	Kaptur	O'Halleran
Crist	Keating	Ocasio-Cortez
Crow	Kelly (IL)	Omar
Cuellar	Khanna	Pallone
Davids (KS)	Kildee	Panetta
Davis, Danny K.	Kilmer	Pappas
Dean	Kim (NJ)	Pascarell
DeFazio	Kind	Payne
DeGette	Kirkpatrick	Perlmutter
DeLauro		Peters

Fudge
Haaland
Wright

NOT VOTING—3

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 205, nays 218, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

YEAS—205

Aderholt	Cawthorn	Gaetz
Allen	Chabot	Gallagher
Amodei	Cheney	Garbarino
Armstrong	Cline	Garcia (CA)
Arrington	Cloud	Gibbs
Babin	Clyde	Gimenez
Bacon	Cole	Gohmert
Baird	Comer	Gonzales, Tony
Balderson	Crawford	Gonzalez (OH)
Banks	Crenshaw	Good (VA)
Barr	Curtis	Gooden (TX)
Bentz	Davidson	Gosar
Bergman	Davis, Rodney	Granger
Bice (OK)	DesJarlais	Graves (LA)
Biggs	Diaz-Balart	Graves (MO)
Bilirakis	Donalds	Green (TN)
Bishop (NC)	Duncan	Greene (GA)
Boebert	Dunn	Griffith
Bost	Emmer	Grothman
Brady	Estes	Guest
Brooks	Fallon	Guthrie
Buchanan	Feenstra	Hagedorn
Buck	Ferguson	Harris
Bucshon	Fischbach	Harshbarger
Budd	Fitzgerald	Hartzler
Burchett	Fitzpatrick	Hern
Burgess	Fleischmann	Herrell
Calvert	Fortenberry	Herrera Beutler
Cammack	Foxy	Hice (GA)
Carl	Franklin, C.	Higgins (LA)
Carter (GA)	Scott	Hill
Carter (TX)	Fulcher	Hinson